DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 765 SP 039 221

AUTHOR Turanli, Adem Sultan; Yildirim, Ali
TITLE A Comparative Assessment of Classroom Management of a High Control and a Low Control Teacher through Student Perceptions and Class Observations.
PUB DATE 1999-12-21
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Foreign Countries; High School Students; High Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Turkey

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and their classroom behaviors. Participants were teachers and students at an English Preparatory School at Erciyes University in Turkey. Two teachers with different orientations (noninterventionist and interventionist) to classroom management were selected, and their 91 students were administered the Classroom Management Questionnaire. The Questionnaire included 36 items under seven subscales (empathy, enthusiasm, instruction, encouragement, control, feedback and correctives, and evaluation). Teachers were asked open-ended questions related to their orientations to managing their classrooms. Researchers also observed the teachers' classes to gather more in-depth data on how they managed their classes. T-test was used as a statistical analysis. The analysis indicated that the two teachers, with their different orientations, differed significantly on all the subscales except for one, enthusiasm. Both orientations provided certain advantages and disadvantages in different contexts. (Contains 42 references.) (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 765

A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT OF A HIGH CONTROL AND A LOW CONTROL TEACHER THROUGH STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND CLASS OBSERVATIONS

Adem Sultan Turanli
Ali Yildirim
Middle East Technical University
Faculty of Education
06531, Ankara, Turkey
tel: 90-312-210 4027
fax: 90-31- 210 1254
e-mail: a12268@tutor.fedu.metu.edu.tr

SP 039221

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Yildirim

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and their classroom management behaviors. Two teachers with different orientations (noninterventionist and interventionist) to classroom management were selected and their students (N=91) were administered the "Classroom Management Questionnaire." The questionnaire included 36 items under seven subscales (empathy, enthusiasm, instruction, encouragement, control, feedback and correctives, and evaluation). The classes of the two teachers were also observed to gather more in-depth data on how the teachers managed their classes. t-test was used as a statistical analysis. The analysis indicated that the two teachers with different orientations differed significantly in all the subscales except for one, enthusiasm.

Introduction

Effective classroom management requires that teachers recognize the ecological nature of behavior and focus on ways they arrange structure, and operate the classroom to promote functional behavior and to minimize misbehavior (Zabel and Zabel, 1996). Burden (1995) states that people in groups behave differently than they do individually. Groups usually take on an identity and personality of their own, and group dynamics may affect and change group personalities. A teacher's approach to classroom management should be adaptable to different circumstances. An adaptable approach to classroom management must provide a thorough assessment of the learning environment, which allows the teacher to adjust his or her management approach to individual classroom needs (Kameenui and Darch, 1995).

There are various factors that influence teachers' orientations to how they would like to manage their classrooms. Their goals, values, and beliefs about classroom management will undoubtedly affect their decisions about the management system that they would like to establish (Burden, 1995; Martin and Baldwin, 1992; Martin and Baldwin, 1994; Martin and Yin,1997). Abdullah (1992) claims that classroom management is often based on a teacher's preconceived or acquired principles that normally divide things into "right" and "wrong" categories. Depending on these categories, they make rules to manage their classes.

Teachers' beliefs about classroom management and control may be classified in various ways. However, Burden (1995) claims that they can be best organized according to the degree of control that teachers exert on students and the classroom. Wolfgang and Glickman (1995) offer a classification of low, medium and high control. Burden (1995) states that the extent to which teachers want to exercise control in their classrooms is the fundamental question when deciding on their approaches to management and discipline. However, even if a teacher chooses a certain model, s/he may need to shift from that model and use elements of other approaches according to the classroom context and the events.

According to low control approaches to classroom control, students have to control their own bahavior, and they have the capacity to make these decisions. The child's thoughts, feelings, ideas, and preferences are taken into account when dealing with instruction, management, and discipline. The teacher has to structure the environment to facilitate students' control over their own behavior. When rules are made, teachers guide the discussion and help students recognize appropriate behavior and select related rules and consequences (Burden, 1995; Charles, 1996; Wolfgang and Glickman, 1995). The Ginott model (Ginott, 1972), group management (Redl, 1972; Redl and Wattenberg, 1959), and transactional analysis (Berne, 1964; Harris, 1967) are low control approaches to classroom management.

Medium control approaches are based on the belief that the teacher and students are jointly responsible for student behavior. Although they accept student-centered psychology, teachers of medium control approaches think that learning takes place in a group context. Hence, the teacher encourages individual student control over behavior whenever possible. However, the teacher places the needs of the group as a whole over the needs of the individual students. The child's thoughts, feelings, ideas, and preferences are taken into account when dealing with instruction, management, and discipline, but the teacher's primary focus is on behavior and meeting the academic needs of the group. Students are given opportunities to control their behavior to help them develop the ability to make appropriate decisions (Burden, 1995; Charles, 1996; Wolfgang and Glickman, 1995). The Dreikurs model (Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper, 1982) the Glasser model (Glasser, 1969), and the Kounin model (Kounin, 1970) are medium control approaches to classroom management (Burden, 1995).

According to high control approaches, the students' growth and development is the result of external conditions. Children are seen to be molded and shaped by influences from their environment. Therefore, teachers need to select desired student behaviors, reinforce appropriate behaviors, and take actions to extinguish inappropriate behaviors. Students' thoughts, feelings, and preferences are given little attention since adults are more experienced in instructional matters and have the responsibility for choosing what is best for student development and behavior control. The rules and procedures are developed by teachers commonly without input from students. Teachers are to reinforce desired behavior and take actions to have students stop inappropriate, undesired behavior (Burden, 1995). The Jones model (Jones, 1987), the Skinner model (Skinner, 1971; Tauber, 1982), and the Canter model (Canter and Canter, 1992) are high control approaches to classroom management (Burden, 1995).

Many studies indicate that teachers show differences in how they handle classroom management issues according to their background characteristics. Chen (1995) found that teachers from different countries vary in their preferences in handling student behaviors.

With the proposition that beliefs regarding classroom management differ among teachers and play an important role in effective instruction, Martin and others conducted a series of research studies were carried out to examine the relationships between teacher characteristics and their management styles. In one of these studies, Martin and Baldwin (1992) found that ideas regarding the nature of the appropriate and inappropriate behaviors and how to control them vary among teachers according to their level of experience in teaching, and can play an important role in classroom management. The results indicated that preservice teachers scored significantly more noninterventionist than experienced teachers who scored more interventionist. In a similar study, Martin and Baldwin (1994) found that novice teachers scored significantly more interventionists than

experienced ones. On this issue, Kolben (1994) argues that experienced teachers evidence a larger repertoire of instructional moves in the principles of learning and attention parameters. Experienced teachers provisioned for the students more than the inexperienced teachers. Inexperienced teachers evidenced less confidence in their choice of instructional strategy. Experienced teachers were elaborate on their instruction more than inexperienced teachers.

Teachers' upbringing in their families also has a bearing on how they manage their classes. Kaplan (1992) indicated that authoritarian upbringing in the family is related to selection of punitive strategies in classroom. Similarly, the school level that teachers are teaching affects teachers' approach to classroom management (Gilberts and Lignugariskraft, 1997). Teachers' perceptions of who they are teaching play a role on how they handle the students (Simon, 1992).

In order to identify how teachers with different orientations to classroom management managed their classes, Stensmo (1995) compared two grade five Swedish teachers with different orientations to classroom management, one with subject matter focus and the other with student focus, in terms of planning, control, motivation, grouping and individualization. The study indicated that both subject matter focus and student focus can be effective in classroom management and that no one management style is better than the other.

Nash (1991) indicated that most teachers manage their classrooms from the traditional bureaucratic organizational management philosophy. However, it was found that most teachers are willing to change their approaches in order to manage their classes more effectively, and they would prefer to employ a flexible model of organizational management in their classrooms. In addition, it was found that teachers who employ the flexible models perceive a higher degree of success than those who implement other models.

The current literature on effective teaching indicates that the teacher should be equipped with a large number of effective strategies that are likely to get students to be on task. As any teacher goes on teaching, s/he tries to discriminate the ones that work from the ones that do not. Specifically for ELT classes, an important indicator of effective classroom management is the amount of guidance teachers provide in class, without which students' failure is unavoidable. Also, the quick flow of activities where students need to change from one activity to another requires the teacher to manage the activities very carefully and to be well prepared for the lesson.

At the same time, the literature on teacher classroom management behaviors indicates that it is difficult to outline a set of behaviors applicable to all classroom management situations. Practical methods which are offered to teachers to apply in their classrooms have often been simplistic and away from seeing the whole picture of the classrooms. In this respect, the literature related to classroom management indicate many inconsistent findings on "effective ways to manage

classrooms." Burden (1995) states that these inconsistencies can be explained by the complexity of the field and the varying conditions under which the issue is studied. Most studies of teacher effectiveness have sought universal characteristics of teachers that would work in any context and with all pupils, but in vain (Good, Biddle and Brophy, 1975).

Teachers working with similar student populations may differ dramatically in their ability to help students develop desirable behavior and increase students' achievement (Jones and Jones, 1995). This points to the differences among teachers in how they manage their classes. Teachers differ significantly from one another in their impact on student learning and student affective variables, such as self-concept and attitudes towards learning and school (Good, Biddle and Brophy, 1975). Therefore, a set of generic behaviors or skills may not be effective in judging a teacher's performance in classroom management. Teachers with different styles may have different management behaviors resulting in various outcomes in the classroom. Thus it seems important to explore possible relations between teachers' orientations and their classroom management behavior, and how these behaviors influence the teaching and the learning process in class.

With these points in mind, the purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and their management behaviors in ELT classes, and explain how these behaviors influence the teaching and learning process in class.

Method

Study Design

The study was conducted at the English Preparatory School at Erciyes University, in Turkey, in the second semester of the 1996-1997 school year. The subjects of the study were the students and the teachers at the English Preparatory School. Two teachers with different orientations to classroom management were identified based on the researcher's informal observations and perceptions, and then they were asked some open-ended questions related to their orientations to managing their classrooms in order to validate the selection. The students of these two teachers were administered a questionnaire on teachers' management behaviors to understand their perceptions about how their teachers managed their classes. In addition, the classes of the two teachers were observed in order to validate the data gathered through the other instruments, and gather more in-depth descriptive data.

Population and Sample Selection

The population included the 890 students and the 31 teachers in the English Preparatory School at Erciyes University. The criteria for selecting the two teachers for the study were teaching experience of at least three years, willingness to participate in the study, openness to talk about

his/her conceptions and perceptions on classroom management. 91 students of these two teachers in 4 classes constituted the student sample, and all they responded to the study questionnaire described below. One of the teachers was teaching 43 students and the second 48.

Classroom Management Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed based on the related literature to explore students' perceptions of their teachers' classroom management behaviors in various dimensions. This questionnaire "Classroom Management Questionnaire," included 36 items and consisted of seven subscales of classroom. Below these subscales were described briefly.

- empathy (items dealing with how sympathetically the teachers approached the students, their behaviors and the difficulties they had while learning English),
- enthusiasm (items dealing with how sympathetically the teachers approached teaching. In other words, these items tried to identify how willing the teachers were to teach, whether they came to the class prepared and whether they reflected their tiredness in their behaviors),
- instruction (items dealing with how well the teachers presented the content, how clearly they used the target language, and how effectively they organized the activities),
- encouragement (items dealing with how much the teachers encouraged their students to learn better, feel confident and participate in the classroom activities),
- control (items dealing with how skillfully and efficiently the teachers could control their classes),
- feedback and correctives (items dealing with how effectively the teachers provided feedback and correctives), and
- evaluation (items dealing with how effectively and efficiently the teachers could evaluate the students' progress in the subject matter).

The students were asked to respond to the items in the questionnaire on a five-point Likert type scale ranging from "never" to "always." A pilot study was conducted to assess the reliability of the questionnaire with 34 students in one class in the same school. The Alpha reliabilities were calculated separately for the seven subscales and the whole scale. The reliability of the whole scale was found to be .857. The reliabilities of the subscales were also calculated: The reliability was calculated .537 for "empathy," .802 for "enthusiasm," .707 for "instruction," .660 for "encouragement," .607 for "control," .747 for "feedback / correctives," and .545 for "evaluation."

Observation Schedule

An observation schedule was prepared in line with the research question and was revised based on the data obtained through the Classroom Management Questionnaire. The two classes of each teacher (a total of four classes) were observed by the researcher for two sessions of fifty minutes (a total of eight sessions). The focus of the observations was limited to the research question. The observations provided more data on how the teacher behaved to show his/her empathy, enthusiasm, and effort to teach well, to encourage students to learn better, to control his/her classes, provide feedback / correctives, and to evaluate students' performance and progress, how the two teachers differed in these terms. The data were used qualitatively and content analyzed.

The data were gathered from the two teachers and their students selected for the study in the second semester of the 1996-1997 school year. First, a total of 94 students in the classes of the two teachers responded to the "Classroom Management Questionnaire". While the data from the questionnaire were being analyzed, observations were carried out in the classes of the sampled teachers. In line with the data from the preliminary observations, an observation schedule was developed, and the classrooms of the two teachers were observed considering the points in the schedule. The later observations were more focused on how the teachers behaved and differed in their management behaviors.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. First, the responses of the students to the "Classroom Management Questionnaire" were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and means. When calculating the mean for each item, in line with Likert-type scales, 1 was assigned to "never", 2 to "rarely", 3 to "sometimes", 4 to "often", and 5 to "always". The frequencies, percentages and the means of the items were presented under the subscales and as a whole scale. When the means for the subscales and the whole scale were calculated, the negative items were reversed as 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2 and 5=1. Based on the students' responses to the items in any scale or subscale, mean scores for the subscales or the whole scale were found by calculating the means for the items in the scale or the subscales. These mean scores were used to examine whether there were any differences between the two teachers. For this analysis, t-test was used as a statistical procedure.

The data from the observations were subjected to content analysis to explore the behavior patterns in relation to classroom management. These patterns were presented in relation to the questionnaire data.

Profile of the Teachers

Below a profile for each teacher selected for this study was presented based on the data obtained through class observations. The low control teacher was called TA, whereas the high control teacher was called TB for practical purposes.

> ***TA***: The teacher gives priority to the students' needs and interests and does not want to hurt the students due to the academic reasons. S/he believes that when students are well motivated, they can often overcome their problems and some problems can and should be ignored if they do not disturb the students in the class. S/he believes that a good atmosphere contributes to the learning environment and student learning. Therefore, s/he often has a smiling face in the classroom and at the beginning of the lesson, s/he has a short talk with the class. S/he also lets in the students who come later than him/her. S/he walks around the students to monitor their personal or group work and s/he often has personal interactions (on-task or off-task) with the students. The teacher often does not attempt to prevent off-task interaction among students. In case of misbehavior, the teacher often uses his/her gestures and mimics to stop misbehaviors.

> ***TB***: The teacher gives priority to the tasks and does not hesitate to scold the student due to their misbehavior. S/he thinks that the first days of a course determines how students tend to behave later. Therefore, s/he needs to manage his/her class carefully in the first days. According to him/her, a well-managed class will enjoy success since more time spent on tasks will lead to more learning. S/he thinks that students tend to abuse their teacher's goodwill since they are not mature enough. Therefore, s/he rarely smiles during the lesson. S/he does not allow students to enter the classroom late, and controls students' behaviors closely to prevent misbehaviors. The teacher rarely walks around the students to monitor their work. In addition, s/he does not create opportunities for interaction often except question-answer sessions. The teacher almost always stands by his/her desk, and seems prepared for the lesson. S/he tries to create a context where there is a smooth lesson flow and the transitions are very clear.

Results

Below the data obtained from the questionnaire and class observations are presented for each subscale in the instrument. First the data from the instrument are tabulated in frequencies, percentages, and means. Second, the data from the observations are presented.

Behaviors Which Indicate Teachers' Empathy

The subscale of "empathy," included items related to how sympathetically the teachers approached the students, their behaviors and the difficulties they had while learning English.

As Table 1 displays, the students responded that TB almost never spoke to the students disdainfully while TA a bit more frequently did so. However, the mean scores did not differ much in this regard. Similarly, the two teachers, according to the students, tried to learn the names of the

students to call them with their names. Yet, almost ten percent of TA's students did not think their teacher did so. Seemingly, in this respect, TB called his/her students with their names slightly more frequently than TA. A great majority of the students stated that their teacher was generally aware of the difficulties that they faced while learning English whereas one-third of TA's students claimed that TA only sometimes was aware of such difficulties and accepted them sympathetically. In line with the previous item, the students' responses indicated that when they had problems, TA treated the students less understandingly and patiently than TB.

Table 1 about here

When a composite mean score was calculated to represent each teacher's score on 'empathy' while teaching English in their classes it was found that TA had a lower mean score of empathy than TB. A t-test pointed that there was a significant difference between the teachers at the .05 level in favor of TB.

The observations showed that the teachers did not tend to contempt the students because of any reason. However, since TB avoided personal interaction with the students, there was nothing vulnerable to be perceived to be as a disdain. It was observed that TB gave more supplementary knowledge to the students about the content being studied. S/he tried to predict the difficulties that they might face, adjusted the lesson accordingly, provided clues to help the students while TA did not display any effort to predict their difficulties.

Table 2 about here

TB was observed to be more patient when, at the moment of a student's hesitation, s/he waited for the answer to a question for a longer time and provided only cues. However, TA did not wait so long and they either gave the answer or addressed to another student. This behavior seemed to increase the anxiety of the students of TA.

It was observed that only a few students asked TB any question related to the subject being studied. Yet, when s/he was asked or when s/he thought that the students needed more explanation than the material provided, s/he went into the details of the subject and tried to make it clear to the students. On the other hand, in the classes of TA, the students were observed to more often ask the teacher questions about the things they did not know or hesitated about. This seemed to be related to proximity (teacher's being close to the students). In other words, since the teacher walked around the students, the students asked him/her more questions.

Another point detected during the observed sessions was that TB was very serious and could keep his/her classes under control during the sessions while TA ignored misbehaviors more often in his/her classes. During observations, it was noticed that TB hardly ever smiled throughout the sessions while TA very often had a smiling face when s/he was instructing, listening to the students, and answering their questions. The students of TA were observed to smile more with the teacher than the students of TB. Similarly, it was observed that from time to time, TA had short dialogues with the students which were not related to the topic of the session, mostly at the beginning of the lesson, and some time in the middle, when students were distracted.

It was also observed that when a moderate disruptive behavior occurred in class, TA often ignored it in order not to get out of track. In such instances, TA often looked at the student/s with a warning facial expression. In such cases, though only few occurred, TB stopped the flow of the lesson to warn the students or to attract their attention. S/he almost never ignored misbehaviors that distracted the other students.

Behaviors Which Indicate Teachers' Enthusiasm

The subscale of "enthusiasm" included items aiming to identify how willing the teachers were to teach, whether they came to the class prepared and whether they reflected their tiredness in their behaviors (see Table 3).

The students' responses to the items in the questionnaire indicated that TB was perceived by the students to be more prepared when they came to the classroom than TA. 14% of the students of TA stated that their teacher never or rarely came to the classroom prepared. Similarly, most of the students of TB stated that when their teacher was tired, they never reflected it in the classes while TA was claimed to do so more frequently. As Table 3 displays, the two teachers kept their willingness to teach their students until the end of the lessons. However, TB was perceived to be slightly more willing to teach the students than TA. In contrast, most of the students of TB stated that their teacher never or almost never had a smiling face while TA was stated to smile more frequently than TB.

Table 3 about here

Based on the composite mean scores for the subscale of enthusiasm, a t-test indicated that the two teachers did not differ in terms of their enthusiasm while teaching English in their classes at the .05 level (see Table 4).

Table 4 about here

The observations indicated that in terms of being prepared when the teachers came to the classroom, it was observed that TB seemed to have planned the sessions better while presenting the subject and rarely hesitated about what to do next. However, TA seemed more spontaneous when s/he presented the lesson and tried to be creative throughout the sessions. Although TA's attempt to be creative increased students' curiosity, from time to time it led to vagueness. Consequently, preparedness seemed to help the teachers have a smooth lesson flow since they did not lose time to think of what they needed to do next. None of the teachers were observed to be weary while teaching. However, throughout the observations, TA seemed very energetic, and tried to seem cheerful most of the time, which did not appear to be pretentious but natural. However, TB seemed to be less energetic since s/he did not even smile during the observed sessions. But, like TA, they were open to the questions posed by the students, and were willing to give satisfactory responses. The two teachers seemed to be highly willing to teach, but in their own way. TB did this in the front of the classroom with a serious face while TA walked around with a smiling face and interacted with the students much more frequently than TB. Reflecting their teachers' attitude, a similar behavior was also observed among the students: the students of TA smiled more often than the students of TB and those students seemed to be happier and more relaxed, which was possibly created by the teacher's behavior.

Behaviors Related to How Teachers Instruct

The subscale of "instruction" included items related to how well the teachers presented the content, how clearly they used the target language, and how effectively they organized the activities (see Table 5).

In terms of the difficulty level of the language the teachers used, the responses of the students indicated that there was almost no difference between the two teachers. More than two-thirds of the students responded that they did not have much difficulty in understanding their teachers in the class.

Table 5 about here

There were some differences between the two teachers in terms of adjusting the transitions from one exercise to the other so that the students did not have difficulty in following the lesson flow. According to the students' responses, TB adjusted the transitions better than TA. In terms of variety of teaching techniques, almost no difference was found between the two teachers. However, the data

from the questionnaires indicated that TB could use time more efficiently when preparing the students for pair or group work. Almost one-fifth of the students of TA claimed that their teacher never or almost never could use the time efficiently.

The students' responses indicated that at the moment of distraction, neither of the teachers could make the needed changes that would attract the students although there seemed to be some differences between the teachers. The data from the questionnaire indicated that in terms of using the board to write the grammatical structures, all the teachers were claimed to use the board much more frequently than sometimes, while TB almost always wrote the new structures clearly on the board. Similarly, TB's instructions for the exercises to be done were found to be clearer and more understandable while TA's instructions were found to be the least clear. Regarding to hearing their teachers clearly during the lessons, the students' responses showed that all the teachers spoke clearly enough for the students to hear and understand while TB was found to be clearer one with some slight differences from the other teacher.

Based on the composite mean scores for the subscale of instruction, a t-test indicated that the two teachers differed significantly in terms of how they managed instruction in their classes at the .05 level in favor of TB (see Table 6). TB had a higher mean score than TA, indicating that TB was perceived by students to manage instruction more efficiently than TA.

Table 6 about here

The observations showed that both of the teachers tried to speak as clearly as possible so that the students could follow them. However, it was observed that TB spoke more slowly and more clearly than TA. TB had pauses between the sentences so that the students could follow and understand what was said. In terms of the difficulty in transitions from one activity to another, there appeared to be a difference between the two teachers. It was observed that TB pointed to the transitions more clearly than TA. In the classes of TA, where there was a fast lesson flow, the transitions sometimes seemed somewhat vague. When the transitions were vague, the students tended to misbehave talking to their friends or dealing with something else rather than with the lesson itself. In such cases, the teacher had to ignore them since s/he did not want to lose time or get distracted. Also, it was observed that TB used the time more effectively when they were preparing their classes for pair- or groupwork. It was observed that these teachers never told their students how to make pairs or groups. In the classes of TB, it seemed that the students had already been taught how to make a pair or a group. It was also observed that the more time was spent for such transitions, the more likely the students had a misbehavior. In the classrooms of TA, making pairs or groups took some time and

the students who had already made a group or pair tended to misbehave such as talking to their friends or dealing with something else which was not related to the lesson.

In terms of making changes in the flow of the lesson, although the program of the school did not allow the teachers much flexibility to make changes in the lesson flow, during the observed sessions, TA seemed somewhat more flexible than TB. This finding was in line with his/her other management behaviors. S/he tried to adjust the lesson according to the students' needs. However, TB tried to follow a fixed lesson plan. Yet, it was observed that the students in the classes of the two teachers were not provided much variability when they were distracted, which made the students bored and distracted. The two teachers mostly insisted on doing the task in turn. In such cases, some students dealt with something off-task such as doodling or whispering to their friends.

When there was a new grammatical structure, which the course books aimed at or not, TB mentioned it and wrote some notes on the board while TA rarely used the board for such structures. In terms of the instructions that the teachers gave to the students about the exercises, both TA and TB were observed to work hard to make them clear and understandable. However, when TA gave the instructions, s/he also added his/her own comments, possibly to make them more interesting to the students. However, it seemed that this strategy did not work for his/her students because from time to time the students seemed to have lost the track. On the other hand, TB only gave the instructions and expected the students to understand them and it seemed that they did. In addition, supporting the data from the questionnaire about clarity of instructions, TB spoke slightly more loudly than the other teacher.

Behaviors Which Relate to Encouraging Students

The subscale of "encouragement" included items related to how much the teachers encouraged their students to learn better, feel confident and participate in the classroom activities (see Table 7).

The data from the questionnaire displayed that TA less often gave each student equal opportunity to participate in the class than TB. Most of the students of TA responded from "rarely" to "often" while the students of TB mostly responded "often" or "always." In line with the previous item, the majority of TA's students responded that their teacher dealt with certain students more closely than the other students. In this regard, TB was found to be more impartial in dealing with the students than TA. In terms of encouraging students to overcome their timidity, TB was claimed to do so more frequently than TA although his/her score for encouragement obtained from the students' responses was quite high. Also, in line with their previous responses, the students stated that TA more often tried to encourage the students to learn English better although the mean scores for this item for

all the two teachers were very high. In terms of encouraging the students to participate in classroom activities, TB was claimed to do so more frequently than TA.

Table 7 about here

Based on the composite mean scores for the subscale of encouragement, a t-test indicated that the two teachers differed significantly in terms of their encouraging their students in their classes at the .05 level (see Table 8) . Although both the teachers exerted these behaviors more frequently than sometimes, TA had a much lower mean than TB, indicating that TB's behaviors were found by students to be more encouraging.

Table 8 about here

The observations indicated that TA posed questions to more students compared to TB, and more students were given the opportunity to state their opinions. The students who participated in the activities in the classes of TA were limited to the same ten to fifteen students. However, TB tried to disperse the time equally although the number of students who willingly participated in the activities was limited to a few students. Although in the questionnaire, TA was claimed to less often try to have the students gain confidence that they could learn English very well, during the observations, TB did not exert any encouraging behavior different from what TA did. This contrast could be due to other management behaviors that were difficult to observe in class during the observations. In addition, in terms of encouraging the students to participate in classroom activities, it was observed that in the classes of TB, the students seemed to be more discouraged from participating in the classroom activities. However, this finding did not validate the data from the questionnaire related to encouraging students to participate in classroom activities.

Behaviors Which Relate to How Teachers Control Their Classes

The subscale of "control" included items related to how skillfully and efficiently the teachers could control their classes (see Table 9).

The students of TB responded that their teacher almost always monitored the class when s/he was giving any explanation while TA had much lower means. Also, the students responded that their teacher (TB) spent almost all the time by his/her desk. However, TA spent much less time by the desk in the classroom. In addition, according to the students' responses, TA used his/her mimics and gestures to solve the problems less often than TB. In line with the previous item, the students of TA responded that the teacher reprimanded them shouting at them more than sometimes, more frequently

than the other teacher. However, the two teachers were found equally strict in controlling the class. Finally, according to the students' responses, TA lost the control of the class more frequently than TB although the two means turned out to be much less than "sometimes."

Table 9 about here

Based on the composite mean scores for the subscale of control, a t-test indicated that at the .05 level, the two teachers significantly differed in terms of how they controlled their classes (see Table 10). Although both the teachers exerted these behaviors more frequently than sometimes, TA had a smaller mean score for control than TB, indicating that TB could control his/her classes more effectively than TA.

The observations showed that when TB was asked a question, s/he spoke to the whole class in response while the other teacher preferred to speak to the student who had asked the question. So TB could control the rest of the class while in the classes of TA, some students were tempted to conduct misbehavior in such moments. This was observed to be related to where they spent most of their time. While TB, as the data from the questionnaire indicated, spent most of the time by his/her desk, the other preferred to walk around to monitor the students. It was also observed that TA used his/her mimics and gestures more often than TB to solve some of the discipline problems in order to avoid interrupting the lesson flow, which enabled the teacher to have a smoother lesson flow. It was observed that TA behaved more tolerantly toward and avoided reprimanding the students due to off-task behaviors.

Table 10 about here

In terms of strictness, TB seemed to be much stricter than TA. However, this was not related to how they treated the students but to how the students behaved in the class. While in the classes of TB, almost none of the students committed any misbehavior, such behaviors were observed in the classes TA. During the observations, it was noticed that TB checked the students that they thought were absent instead of spending much time to call roll by calling each student and these two teachers mostly did this silently while the students were on task. On the other hand, for the roll-call, TA preferred to call each student at the beginning of the session and had some difficulty in controlling the class during the roll-call.

Behaviors Aimed at Giving Feedback / Correctives to Students

The subscale of "feedback / correctives" included items related to how effectively the teachers provided feedback and correctives (see Table 11).

According to the students' responses, TB less often monitored the students carefully in order to see how they were doing the given task, which turned out to be in line with the data on how much time the teachers spent by their desks. TA checked the students' work much more often. The students responded that TA least often gave satisfactory responses to the questions posed by the students while TB did so the most often. The questionnaire data displayed that TB hardly ever walked around the students to help them while TA did so somewhat less frequently than "often." Finally, it was responded that TB most frequently gave satisfactory correctives related to the mistakes that the students had made.

Table 11 about here

Based on the composite mean scores for the subscale of feedback and correctives, a t-test indicated that at the .05 level, the two teachers significantly differed in terms of how effectively they provided feedback and correctives (see Table 12). Although the two teachers exerted these behaviors more frequently than sometimes, TB had a smaller mean score for feedback and correctives than TA, indicating that TB provided more feedback and correctives or provided them more effectively than TA.

Table 12 about here

During the observations, it was noticed that while TA walked around more and checked what the students were doing, TB rarely did this. TB spent most of his time by his/her desk and preferred monitoring the class from the front of the class. TB, when requested an explanation or clarification by any student, preferred to give the explanation to the whole class, while TA preferred to address to the student(s) who had requested explanation. Walking around the students while they were doing any given task made it easier for TA to see the students' work and give them instant feedback. On the contrary, TB gave longer correctives related to the mistakes that the students had made. It was observed in the classrooms that when TB needed to give any explanation related to any mistake, s/he preferred to address it to the whole class, whereas the other teacher preferred not to interfere with what the other students were doing.

Behaviors Aimed to Evaluate Students' Performance

The subscale of "evaluation" included items related to how effectively and efficiently the teachers could evaluate the students' progress in the subject matter (see Table 13).

Table 13 about here

The data displayed that TB asked different students to read their work after a writing task more often than TA. TB provided the slow learners with longer time when s/he asked any questions than TA. In line with the previous item, TB more often provided the students with opportunity for practicing the things that they had studied. However, the other teacher's score was also quite high. The two teachers equally asked different students various questions in order to see whether the topic had been understood. Their means for this behavior were only somewhat higher than "sometimes." According to the students' responses, TA and TB often set challenging assignments related to important topics.

Based on the composite mean scores for the subscale of evaluation, a t-test indicated that at the .05 level, the two teachers differed significantly in terms of how they evaluated their students' performance and progress in favor of TB (see Table 14). TB had a higher score than TA, indicating that TB displayed more behaviors aiming to evaluate students' performance and progress or could evaluate their progress more effectively.

Table 14 about here

Observations in the classrooms indicated after a writing task, TB asked more students to read their work while TA did this with fewer students and that when TB asked the students any question, s/he provided somewhat longer wait-time for the students who needed to think before they answered. However, TA preferred to provide cues if they waited some time to think. In such cases, the students either completed the information that the teacher provided or completely avoided answering it. In terms of providing the time the students might need in order to practice what they had studied, both TA and TB often asked the students to practice the topic studied. However, in order to check whether the subject had been understood or not, the two teachers assumed the exercises in the book to be enough. As for assignments, neither of the teachers was observed to set any considerable assignments to be done at home.

Teachers' Overall Classroom Management Behaviors

When considered as a whole, a composite mean score was obtained calculating the mean of all the items in the seven subscales in the questionnaire in order to determine whether there were any differences between the two teachers with different orientations toward classroom management. A t-test indicated that at the .05 level, the two teachers differed significantly in terms of managing their classes in favor of TB (see Table 15). In line with this, it is seen that TB had a higher mean score than TA, indicating that TB was perceived to be more effective in classroom management.

Table 15 about here

The data from the questionnaire and the class observations mostly supported each other. The study indicated that TB was perceived by the students and observed by the researcher to be more effective in their management behaviors than TA. although the students in the classes of TA appeared to be more cheerful and willing to participate in the activities, the instructional activities did not seem to be well planned. There seemed to be chaos at the moments when the students participated in the activities since the teacher often ignored the misbehaviors. In contrast, TB seemed to have better-planned sessions and more smoothly running lessons although his/her students appeared to be bored in the classroom. Although the students of TB were not very willing to participate in the activities or the teacher did not encouraged them to do so, the students' responses indicated that they did not complain much about their teacher and was appreciated more than TA.

Discussion

The low control teacher (TA) is more student-oriented and assumes less rights and responsibilities compared to those of students. S/he prefers to provide his/her students with more flexibility in making the rules, thinking that they are mature enough to choose the "right" or the "wrong." This teacher seems more student-oriented; in other words, in making the decisions related to the classroom life and organizing the activities, students are offered the priority and the teacher expects students to manage their behaviors. On the other hand, the high control teacher (TB) seems to be stricter and more task-oriented. S/he believes that students cannot identify their educational needs and the teacher is the only person to make the decisions. In addition, the high control teacher (TB) believes that a teacher should do his/her best to help his/her students as long as they are willing to learn; if they are not attentive and willing to learn, the teacher does not have to worry about the performance of his/her students.

Both questionnaire and observation data show that the low and high control teachers appear to be quite different in their classroom management behaviors. Although interaction is claimed to create

better learning environments (Jones and Jones, 1995), lack of it seems to decrease misbehavior in ELT classes, like in classes of the high control teacher (TB). Having too much interaction, as the low control teacher (TA) does, leads to students' abuse of this teacher behavior. When the teacher displays many cheerful behaviors, students also tend to misbehave as in the classes of the low control teacher (TA). This finding is consistent with what McLoughlin (1984) warns the teacher against, by saying that when students notice that their teacher is apt to be abused, they will do it. Having a short informal conversation with class enables the teacher to have an easy start, giving students the time to make their materials ready, as in the classes of the low control teacher (TA). However, some students tend to keep this conversation too long. This finding is consistent with Arends's (1988) suggestion related to the procedures to follow at the beginning of a lesson. Arends suggests that the teacher should have a short conversation with students to motivate them for the lesson.

Predicting the difficulties that the students may face, as the high control teacher (TB) does, decreases the possibility of ambiguity and positively contributes to the discipline in the class. This finding supports the point made by Zabel and Zabel (1996) on the effects of ambiguity in class, indicating that when the instructions are clear to students, less misbehaviors occur in class. In addition, Rosiek (1994) suggests that the teacher should try to predict the possible difficulties the student may encounter, claiming that this teacher behavior helps the students find answers to possible questions before they come out and increases the instructional time to be used since the lesson flow is not interrupted due to such questions. On the other hand, while walking around students, as the low control teacher (TA) does, encourages students to ask their questions in mind and staying by teacher desk discourages students from asking the teacher any questions. In their discussions related to effective teacher behaviors in class, McLoughlin (1984) and Rose (1989) emphasized the importance of the teacher walking around and monitoring students' work. Providing too long explanations when a question is asked, as the high control teacher (TB) does, bores some students since they are likely to be found redundant. On the other hand, giving the clarification to the student who has asked the question requires the teacher to go on monitoring the rest of the class. Otherwise, when the teacher loses his/her eye with the rest of the class, as the low control teacher (TA) often does, students tend to misbehave. Behaving patiently and empathetically, as the high control teacher (TB) does, is appreciated by students since it relaxes them. In line with it, providing enough wait-time after asking students a question, as the high control teacher (TB) does, contributes positively to the students' learning and the opposite, as the low control teacher (TA) does, makes students either nervous or panicked.

Being prepared for the lesson, as the high control teacher (TB) does, enables the teacher to have smoothly flowing lessons because there is little ambiguity in the flow of instruction. This finding supports what Phelps (1991) suggests related to avoidance of ambiguity in instructions provided by

the teacher so that the lesson could flow more smoothly. However, using spontaneity as a teaching style, as the low control teacher (TA) does, evokes students' curiosity in exchange of ambiguity. Although smiling with students is a desired behavior (Wilcox, 1983), it is likely to be abused by some students, as in the classes of the low control teacher (TA) and may provoke students to misbehave due to misinterpretation of the teacher's empathy. The place where the teacher stands in class while teaching significantly determines how easily students can ask questions without any hesitation. When the teacher walks around, students feel more comfortable to ask their questions. Standing by the desk, as the high control teacher (TB) often does, prevents interaction between students and the teacher. This finding is consistent with what Fifer (1986) found in the study related to the relationship between where the teacher stands and how students behave, stating that the teachers' position in class is an important indicator of how students perceive the learning environment.

Clarity in instructions provided by the teacher decreases the number of possible misbehaviors likely to occur due to ambiguity, as in the classes of the high control teacher (TB). The high control teacher (TB) is slow but clear in transitions from one activity to another, which helps him/her have smoothly running classes. However, the low control teacher (TA) is fast but unclear in transitions, and s/he consequently faces more problems. This finding supports what Arends (1988) claims about the effects of lack of clarity and ambiguity, claiming that they lead to misbehaviors in class. In addition, in line with Arends's discussion on the effectiveness in preparing students for pair-works or group-works, it saves time and decreases the amount of misbehavior, as in the classes of the high control teacher (TB). Flexibility in making changes in the lesson flow as the low control teacher (TA) does decreases the monotony in class and arouses the students' interest when they are distracted.

Also, using the board effectively when giving a new grammatical structure or teaching new words, as the high control teacher (TB) does, attracts the students' attention, decreases the ambiguity and prevents the questions students may need to ask afterwards. This finding is consistent with McLoughlin's (1984) suggestion that the teacher should often use the board as an instructional tool when presenting a new subject. Adding some comments on how the activity is relevant to students' future needs, as the low control teacher (TA) does, contributes positively to the students' interests. This finding is in line with what Reis (1988) discussed related to effective teacher techniques saying that relevancy improves student learning. On the other hand, using all the allotted time with on-task activities, as the high control teacher (TB) does, is appreciated by students only when the activities are interesting. However, providing too much detail while explaining a new structure, as the high control teacher (TB) does, bores some of the students.

Distributing the time among students equally, as the high control teacher (TB) does, and providing them with more time, as the low control teacher (TA) does, so that students can participate in the activities encourages students to be more active in class. This finding supports what Kauffman,

Pullen, and Akers (1986) claim in their discussion on how to increase student participation. They state that the teacher should distribute the time equally and behave impartially in class. Having a very serious face while teaching, as the high control teacher (TB) does, often discourages students from participating in the activities. In addition to encouragement, forcing students to answer questions randomly, as TB does, enables some timid students to get rid of their timidity. When students experience success in answering the question in such cases, they later wish to participate willingly.

When asked a question, addressing the explanation to the whole class, as the high control teacher (TB) does, enables the teacher to monitor the whole class although some students who do not need any explanation about the topic may get bored. However, the opposite, speaking to the student who needs the explanation as the low control teacher (TA) does, leads to misbehavior if the teacher cannot go on monitoring the class. This finding is in consistent with Arends's (1988) suggestion that the teacher should go on monitoring all the students while s/he is dealing with something else. On the other hand, using gestures and mimics to stop misbehaviors, as the low control teacher (TA) often does, are rarely enough to stop serious misbehaviors so they must be supported with other management behaviors. Although the strictness of the high control teacher (TB) is something undesired in class, the permissiveness of the low control teacher (TA) causes more problems.

Calling roll while the students are on task as the high control teacher (TB) does prevents some prospective management problems while roll-call at the beginning of the lesson as in the classes of the low control teacher (TA) allows students the time to get ready for the lesson, and consequently prevents some problems that the teacher is likely to face at the beginning of any session. Keeping class under control successfully helps students feel confident and secure. While the strictness of the high control teacher (TB) discourages students from participating, as Morris and Elliott (1985) claimed in their discussion on better classroom discipline, the over-tolerance of the low control teacher (TA) gives way to more problems and sometimes causes the teacher to lose the control of class.

Walking around students and monitoring what students are doing, as the low control teacher (TA) often does, enables the teacher to give cues and correctives to students instantly and individually. This finding supports Rose's (1989) thought that walking around and monitoring students enables the teacher to see better student work and give them correctives in need. However, standing by the desk makes it easier to monitor the whole class in exchange for less opportunity for monitoring students individually. This finding is consistent with what Fifer (1986) found in the study on the relationship between where the teacher stands and how the students behave. Fifer says that the teacher can control the class more easily when he is in the front whereas the teacher walking around can provide individual help and feedback. Providing satisfactory explanations for students' questions,

as the high control teacher (TB) does, decreases misbehaviors and increases students' willingness to participate in the activities. This finding supports McLoughlin's (1984) suggestion that the teacher should provide clear explanations on students' questions. Also, talking to the whole class about the mistakes of any student, as the high control teacher (TB) does, discourages students from the activities in which they are likely to make mistakes about.

Asking students to read out their work after a writing task as the high control teacher (TB) does is found encouraging by the students. Providing students with enough time to think of the answer after asking a question, as the high control teacher (TB) often does, helps to decrease students' worries. However, posing the question to another student if the first student delays to answer it, as the low control teacher (TA) does, bothers students and makes students nervous. This finding supports McLoughlin's (1984) and Burden's (1995) suggestions on providing enough time for students since it decreases students' tension.

In a broad sense, students who want to learn would like to be in a well-managed classroom. Although a teacher who gives priority to students rather than tasks may sound more likable by students, this study indicated that students are not so satisfied with the applications of a teacher as long as instructional tasks do not provide students with enough help in learning the topic. A low control teacher mostly prefers to emphasize students' needs and interests whereas a high control teacher chooses to give priority to the classroom tasks. Although the high control teacher seems to be a better classroom manager, the low control teacher has some comparatively stronger behaviors. In other words, both orientations provide certain advantages and disadvantages in different contexts. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the behaviors that contribute to student learning. There is a need to cautiously combine certain behaviors of both orientations in effective classroom management. This study also indicated the need to be able to vary some of the behaviors according to the demands of the class context.

References

Abdullah, S. (1992). Cross-cultural understanding (sensitivity) – An overlooked aspect in language teacher training. Guidelines. 14 (2), 61-67.

Arends, R. I. (1988). Learning to teach. New York: Random House.

Berne, E. (1964). Games people play: The psychology of human relations. New York: Ballantine Books.

Burden, B. (1995). Classroom management and discipline: Methods to facilitate cooperation and instruction. New York: Longman.

Canter, L. and Canter, M. (1992). Assertive discipline: positive behavior management for today's schools (rev. ed.). Santa Monica, CA: Lee Canter & Associates.

Charles, C. M. (1996). Building classroom discipline (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Chen, J. J. (1995). "The perceptions of teachers and fourth grade students from China, Taiwan, and the US toward classroom management strategies." Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., and Pepper, F. C. (1982). Maintaining sanity in the classroom: Classroom management techniques (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Fifer, F. L. (1986). Effective classroom management. Academic Therapy. 21 (4), 401-409.

Gilberts, G. H. and Lignugariskraft, B. (1997). Classroom management and instruction competencies for preparing elementary and special education teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education. 13 (6), 597-610.

Ginott, H. G. (1972). Teacher and child. New York: Macmillan.

Glasser, W. (1969). Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.

Good, T. L., Biddle, B. J. and Brophy, J. E. (1975). Teachers make a difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Harris, T. A. (1967). I'm OK - You're OK. New York: Avon Books.

Jones, F. H. (1987). Positive classroom discipline. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, V. F. and Jones, L. S. (1995). Comprehensive classroom management: Creating positive learning environment for all students. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kameenui, E. J. and Darch, C. B. (1995). Instructional classroom management: A Proactive approach to behavior management. New York: Longman.

Kaplan, C. (1992). Teachers' punishment histories and their selection of disciplinary strategies. Contemporary Educational Psychology. 17 (3), 258-265.

Kauffman, J. M, Pullen, P. L., and Akers, E. (1986). Classroom management: Teacher-child-peer relationships. Focus on Exceptional Children. 19 (1), 1-10.

Kolben, D. W. (1994). "A study of experienced and inexperienced teachers' classroom practices, the effects of these practices and post-interactive thoughts." Unpublished Ed. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts-Lowell.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and group management. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Martin, N. K. and Baldwin, B. (1992). "Beliefs regarding classroom management style. The differences between preservice and experienced teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Knoxville, Louisiana.

Martin, N. K. and Baldwin, B. (1994). "Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between novice and experienced teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association. San Antonio.

Martin, N. K. and Baldwin, B. (1996). "Perspectives regarding classroom management style: Differences between elementary and secondary teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Martin, N. K. and Yin, Z. (1997). "Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin.

Matus. D. E. (1995). "An innovative strategy for support of student teachers in secondary urban schools: A description of an exploratory project." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization. Portsmouth.

McLoughlin, C. S. (1984). Positive discipline: A compendium of more than 250 aphorisms. The Clearing House. 57 (Feb), 273-280.

Morris, R. C. and Elliott, J. C. (1985). Understanding alternatives for classroom discipline. The Clearing House. 58 (May), 408-412.

Nash, J. W. (1991). "Organizational philosophy and reality of classroom management: Implications for the restructuring movement." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. Vanderbilt University.

Phelps, P. H. (1991). Helping teachers excel as classroom managers. The Clearing House. 64 (March-April), 241-242.

Redl, E. and Wattenberg, W. W. (1959). Mental hygiene in teaching (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Redl, E. (1972). When we deal with children (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Reis, E. M. (1988). Effective teacher techniques: Implications for better discipline. The Clearing House. 61, 356-357.

Rose, A. C. (1989). What do effective teachers do? The Clearing House. 63 (Dec), 181-183.

Rosiek, J. (1994). Caring, classroom management, and teacher education: The need for case study and narrative methods. Teaching Education. 6 (1), 21-30.

Simon, M. S. (1992). "Effects of labeling, attributions, and classroom context on teachers' disciplinary practices." Unpublished Ph. Dissertation. Indiana University.

Skinner, B. F. (1971). Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Knopf.

Stensmo, C. (1995). "Classroom management styles: Two case studies." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, April, 18-22.

Tauber, R. (1982). Negative reinforcement: A positive strategy in classroom management. Clearing House. 56, 64-67.

Wilcox, R. T. (1983). Discipline made gentle. The Clearing House. 57 (Sept), 30-35.

Wolfgang, C. H. and Glickman, C. D. (1995). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Zabel, R. H. and Zabel, M. K. (1996). Classroom management in context: Orchestrating positive learning environment. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Table 1

Behaviors Related to Teachers' Empathy for Students (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
The teacher speaks to the students disdainfully.								
TA	53.5	20.9	18.6	4.7	2.3	1.81	1.05	43
TB	77.1	10.4	6.3	4.2	2.1	1.44	.94	48
The teacher tries to learn the names of the students.								
TA	9.5	.0	.0	28.6	61.9	4.33	1.18	42
TB	.0	2.1	10.4	16.7	70.8	4.56	.77	48
The teacher is aware of the difficulties the students may face while learning English and accepts them sympathetically.								
TA	4.7	11.6	32.6	37.2	14.0	3.44	1.03	43
TB	4.2	6.3	6.3	16.7	66.7	4.35	1.12	48
The teacher treats the students understandingly and patiently who have difficulty learning English.								
TA	.0	14.0	27.9	23.3	34.9	3.79	1.08	43
TB	2.1	2.1	4.2	33.3	58.3	4.44	.85	48

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Empathy for Students

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.94	.70	43
TB	4.48	.65	48

t = (89) 3.83, p=.000

Table 3

Behaviors Indicating Enthusiasm (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
The teacher comes to class prepared for the lesson.								
TA	2.3	11.6	7.0	41.9	37.2	4.00	1.07	43
TB	.0	2.1	2.1	14.6	81.3	4.75	.60	48
When the teacher is tired, s/he reflects this to the class.								
TA	18.6	30.2	34.9	11.6	4.7	2.53	1.08	43
TB	68.8	16.7	10.4	.0	4.2	1.54	.99	48
The teacher keeps his/her willingness to teach throughout the sessions.								
TA	.0	9.3	27.9	27.9	34.9	3.88	1.00	43
TB	2.1	2.1	4.2	18.8	72.9	4.58	.85	48
The teacher has a smiling face throughout the sessions.								
TA	4.7	4.7	23.3	30.2	37.2	3.91	1.11	43
TB	43.8	45.8	4.2	4.2	2.1	1.75	.89	48

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 4

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Enthusiasm Perceived by Students

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.81	.84	43
TB	3.88	.48	48

t = (89) .50, p=.617

Table 5

Behaviors Related to Instruction (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
The teacher speaks English at a level the students do not have difficulty understanding.								
TA	4.8	2.4	21.4	38.1	33.3	3.93	1.05	42
TB	22.9	6.3	2.1	12.5	56.3	3.73	1.70	48
The teacher adjusts the transitions between exercises so that the students do not have difficulty following.								
TA	2.3	9.3	25.6	41.9	20.9	3.70	.99	43
TB	8.3	6.3	6.3	20.8	58.3	4.15	1.29	48
The teacher tries various teaching techniques in order to attract the students to the lesson.								
TA	25.6	37.2	25.6	9.3	2.3	2.26	1.03	43
TB	33.3	29.2	16.7	10.4	10.4	2.35	1.33	48
When preparing the students for pair- or group-work, s/he uses the time efficiently.								
TA	9.3	9.3	25.6	37.2	18.6	3.47	1.18	43
TB	4.2	2.1	12.5	35.4	45.8	4.17	1.02	48
When the students are distracted, the teacher makes changes in the lesson flow that can attract the students.								
TA	27.9	11.6	32.6	20.9	7.0	2.67	1.29	43
TB	31.3	20.8	22.9	12.5	12.5	2.54	1.38	48
If there is any grammatical structure related to the subject being studied, the teacher writes it clearly on the board.								
TA	.0	9.3	32.6	30.2	27.9	3.77	.97	43
TB	.0	2.1	.0	2.1	95.8	4.92	.45	48
The teacher gives clear and understandable instructions for the exercises to be done.								
TA	2.3	9.3	16.3	51.2	20.9	3.79	.97	43
TB	.0	2.1	.0	20.8	77.1	4.73	.57	48
During the lessons, the students can hear clearly what the teacher is saying								
TA	.0	7.0	11.6	20.9	60.5	4.35	.95	43
TB	.0	2.1	2.1	18.8	77.1	4.71	.62	48

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 6

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Behaviors Related to Instruction

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.49	.60	43
TB	3.91	.60	48

t = (89) 3.32, p=.001

Table 7

Behaviors Related to Encouragement (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
The teacher gives each student equal opportunity to participate in the class.								
TA	4.7	16.3	27.9	20.9	30.2	3.56	1.22	43
TB	.0	4.2	2.1	20.8	72.9	4.63	.73	48
The teacher deals with certain students more closely.								
TA	39.5	23.3	14.0	18.6	4.7	2.26	1.29	43
TB	66.7	22.9	2.1	6.3	2.1	1.54	.97	48
The teacher helps us to overcome our timidity while we are trying to speak English.								
TA	7.0	11.6	27.9	32.6	20.9	3.49	1.16	43
TB	8.3	4.2	10.4	25.0	52.1	4.08	1.25	48
The teacher tries to have the students gain the confidence that they can learn English very well.								
TA	14.3	26.2	40.5	9.5	9.5	2.74	1.13	42
TB	14.6	10.4	18.8	39.6	16.7	3.33	1.29	48
The teacher tries to encourage the students to take part in class activities								
TA	7.0	14.0	20.9	32.6	25.6	3.56	1.22	43
TB	2.1	6.3	12.5	39.6	39.6	4.08	.99	48

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 8

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Behaviors Related to Encouragement

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.42	.78	43
TB	4.12	.70	48

$t = (89)\ 4.51,\ p = .000$

Table 9

Behaviors Related to Control (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
The teacher keeps monitoring the class while s/he is giving any explanation related to the lesson								
TA	2.3	16.3	34.9	32.6	14.0	3.40	1.00	43
TB	.0	6.3	4.2	27.1	62.5	4.46	.85	48
The teacher spends most of the time by his/her desk.								
TA	14.0	41.9	30.2	11.6	2.3	2.47	.96	43
TB	2.1	4.2	4.2	22.9	66.7	4.48	.92	48
The teacher tries to solve the discipline problems using his/her mimics and gestures instead of interrupting the lesson flow.								
TA	14.0	23.3	11.6	37.2	14.0	3.14	1.32	43
TB	6.5	8.7	15.2	34.8	34.8	3.83	1.20	46
The teacher reprimands the students shouting at them.								
TA	4.7	25.6	25.6	30.2	14.0	3.23	1.13	43
TB	50.0	29.2	14.6	2.1	4.2	1.81	1.04	48
The teacher is in a strict mood in order to control the class.								
TA	.0	39.5	32.6	18.6	9.3	2.98	.99	43
TB	27.1	8.3	20.8	12.5	31.3	3.13	1.61	48
The teacher loses the control of the class while calling roll.								
TA	27.9	23.3	32.6	9.3	7.0	2.44	1.20	43
TB	70.8	14.6	6.3	2.1	6.3	1.58	1.13	48

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 10

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Behaviors Related to Control

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.24	.64	43
TB	3.54	.49	48

t = (89) 2.60, p=.011

Table 11

Behaviors Related to Feedback and Correctives (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
During the lesson, the teacher monitors each student carefully in order to see how they are doing the task.								
TA	.0	16.3	16.3	37.2	30.2	3.81	1.05	43
TB	12.5	29.2	27.1	16.7	14.6	2.92	1.25	48
The teacher gives satisfactory answers to the questions that the students ask.								
TA	4.7	.0	23.3	60.5	11.6	3.74	.85	43
TB	.0	.0	2.1	29.2	68.8	4.67	.52	48
While the students are doing any classroom task, the teacher walks around the students and helps them.								
TA	4.7	16.3	7.0	37.2	34.9	3.81	1.22	43
TB	50.0	29.2	14.6	.0	6.3	1.83	1.10	48
The teacher gives satisfactory correctives related to the mistakes that the students have made.								
TA	2.3	7.0	27.9	39.5	23.3	3.74	.98	43
TB	.0	.0	4.3	34.0	61.7	4.57	.58	47

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 12

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Behaviors Related to Feedback and Correctives

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.78	.78	43
TB	3.49	.60	48

t = (89) 2.01, p=.048

Table 13

Behaviors Related to Evaluation (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD	N
	0	1	2	3	4			
After a writing task, the teacher asks different students to read their work.								
TA	7.0	11.6	14.0	37.2	30.2	3.72	1.22	43
TB	2.1	.0	8.3	29.2	60.4	4.46	.82	48
The teacher provides the students with the time they may need when s/he asks comparatively slow learners any questions.								
TA	4.7	11.6	16.3	41.9	25.6	3.72	1.12	43
TB	2.1	4.2	4.2	29.2	60.4	4.42	.92	48
In order to reinforce, the teacher provides the students with the opportunity of practicing what they have studied.								
TA	4.7	4.7	37.2	44.2	9.3	3.49	.91	43
TB	2.1	.0	12.5	27.1	58.3	4.40	.87	48
The teacher asks different students various questions related to the subject in order to check whether the subject has been understood.								
TA	7.0	20.9	23.3	32.6	16.3	3.30	1.19	43
TB	12.8	14.9	23.4	31.9	17.0	3.26	1.28	47
The teacher sets challenging assignments related to important topics.								
TA	4.7	11.6	20.9	16.3	46.5	3.88	1.26	43
TB	2.1	6.4	27.7	34.0	29.8	3.83	1.01	47

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 14

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Behaviors Related to Evaluation

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.62	.68	43
TB	4.08	.60	48

t = (89) 3.41, p=.001

Table 15

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Teachers' Overall Management Behaviors

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.57	.56	43
TB	3.92	.45	48

t = (89) 3.22, p=.002